Application No. 10/590,591

Paper Dated: May 24, 2010

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of March 24, 2010

Attorney Docket No. 0470-062554

REMARKS

Claims in the case are 54-67, upon entry of this Amendment. Claims 54-57 have been amended, claims 58-67 have been added, and claims 28-53 have been cancelled without prejudice herein.

Claim Amendments:

Claims 54-57 have each been amended herein to include the subject matter of claim 40, from which each depends, so as to be in independent form.

Claims 58-67 have been added, and in each case depend as recited from one of claims 54-57. Support for added claims 58-67 is provided by the specification.

Claims 28-53 have been cancelled without prejudice, in light of the election as discussed further herein.

Claims 1-27 were previously cancelled without prejudice in a Preliminary Amendment.

Election:

In response to the Restriction Requirement of March 24, 2010, Applicants elect the invention of Group V (i.e., claims 54-57) with traverse. Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement for reasons including, but not limited to, examination of the claims of Groups I through V together would not represent an undue burden because each group requires: a) a solution of lactoferrin of acid pH; and/or b) a solution of lactoferrin and a metal chelating agent.

Application No. 10/590,591 Paper Dated: May 24, 2010

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of March 24, 2010

Attorney Docket No. 0470-062554

CONCLUSION

The present Amendment is not believed to represent the entry of new matter into the case. Entry of the present Amendment, withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement, and an early action on the merits are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

James R. Franks

Registration No. 42,552

Attorney for Applicants

436 Seventh Avenue

700 Koppers Building

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Telephone: (412) 471-8815 Facsimile: (412) 471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com